Two Plums Still Hang 7

The federal court vacancy created by the transfer of Judge Bodine to the Tew Jersey supreme court, is continuing to worry the politicians, who are still hopeful that the appointment will fall to their respective favorites, and South Jersey is not without a hopeful glance in that direction

in that direction.

William B. Knight, assemblyman from Camden, and majority leader of the house in the 1929 legislature, no longer stands in the limelight in this regard. Instead, there is a well authenticated report that when the 1930 legislature convenes he will be the speaker for that session. No recommendation has gone

to the Department of Justice concerning Knight, and it is possible that Charles A. Wolverton, of Camden, may win the desired place upon the bench.

If reported agreements mean anything, republican leaders are a unit in favoring South Jersey in the appointment, but United States District Attorney Phillip Forman, of Trenton, nevertheless is becoming a formidable figure in this contest, and since anything can happen in politics South Jersey, should he succeed Bodine, is expectant that it will get the district attorneyship. As a hot weather issue the vacancy provides plenty of room for speculation and that, after all, is the spice of politics.

Knight Out of Race for Judge

Camden Assembly Member
Withdraws as Candidate
to Succeed Bodine

Assemblyman William B. Knight of Camden today announced his withdrawal as a candidate for United State District Court judge to succeed Joseph L. Bodine, who was appointed to the New Jersey Supreme Court by Governor Larson.

There are reports among the South

Court Upsets Ouig Verdict

Federal Circuit Reversés Conviction Here in

Warren Bank Case

PHILADELPHIA—The United States Circuit Court of Appeals today reversed the Federal District Court of New Jersey in the conviction of Charles H. Quig of Easton, Pa., on a charge of violating the national banking laws. The Appellate Court ordered a new trial. Quig was tried before Judge Clark at Newark.

Admission of certain evidence by the court and District Attorney Winne's opening to the jury are among points criticized by the appelate court, which consisted of Circuit Judge Buffington and District Judges Schoonmaker and Thompson. The opinion refers to a note given by Quig as a representative of the Triangle Tire Rack Company to A. Roy Hunsberger, cashier of the Hope (Warren County) National Bank.

"The sharp issue in this case," says the Court of Appeals, whether Quig intended to injure and defraud the bank. It would seem that if he gave the Triangle Company note in the belief that it would be discounted and, when advised that this first note was not satisfactory, Immediately gave a note endorsed by one Porter, who afterwards paid the note, no criminal intent could fairly or properly be inferred.

"In this situation where the guilt of a defendant rested upon a slender foundation, extra care in the trial should have been observed that the defendant's rights might not be unduly

prejudiced.

"When the case was presented to this court, two matters stood out as of importance, and are controlling factors in the decision of the case. These relate first to remarks of the district attorney in opening the case to the jury, and second, in relation to admission by the court against the defendant's objection of the record of certain offenses theretofore committed by the defendant."

The opinion goes into District Attorney Winne's opening, citing how he had called Hunsberger from the Atlanta penitentiary, where he had been sentenced to ten years after pleading guilty, and put him on the witness stand and compared him and Quig to the detriment of Quig. The opinion adds:

"The District Attorney's statements went far beyond the rights possessed by government counsel in outlining its case to the jury; contained statements wholly incompetent; were seriously prejudicial to the defendant's case, and should not have been admitted. The court would well have been justified in withdrawing a juror and continuing the case.

"In the second place, against the

objection of the defendant's attorney